

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/822,002

Confirmation No.: 1578

Applicants : Heung-sup JEONG et al.

Filed : April 12, 2004

Group Art Unit: 2852

Customer No. : 38209

Examiner: Chen, Sophia S.

For: ELECTROPHOTOGRAPHIC PRINTER

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.104**

Sir:

The Examiner provided a Statement of Reason for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance and Fee Due May 30, 2006, mailed February 28, 2006, in which the Examiner indicated that Claim 24 is allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a door controlling unit to control the second door from being opened unless the developing unit is retracted away from the photosensitive drum unit by a predetermined distance as set forth in the claimed combination. The Examiner also indicated that claim 28 is allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art of record does not teach or suggest a printer comprising a door locking unit to allow the opening switch to operate the second door to be opened only when the first door is opened as set forth in the claimed combination."

As specified in MPEP 1302.14, "care must be taken to ensure that such reasons are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims." It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Statement is not an accurate quote with respect to each of the allowed claims, and instead, raises "possible misinterpretations, and

possible estoppel effects" (MPEP 1302.04) and accordingly, should be disregarded.

The Examiner's statement appears to unnecessarily limit the claims to, for example, claims 1-15 neither include the door controlling unit nor the door locking unit, and claims 24 and 28 are not limited to the door controlling unit and the door locking unit, respectively, as set forth in the claimed combination. While being useful in understanding the invention, the Examiner's comments could lead to an unwarranted and unnecessary narrowing interpretation of the claims. Therefore, it is further submitted that the claims should not be interpreted based on the Examiner's statement.

It is further submitted that the claims are not constrained by such device limitations and that the claims speaks for themselves as to what features are included therein and are their own best evidence as to the reasons for allowance of same.

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: May 30, 2006
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 

Seungman Kim
Registration No. 50,012